UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION N		
10/809,152	03/24/2004	Patrick L. Edson	MWS-104RCE	7394	
	7590 04/28/200 OCKFIELD, LLP/THE	EXAMINER			
FLOOR 30, SU	ITE 3000	ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D			
One Post Office Boston, MA 02			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ŕ			2175		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/809,152	EDSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Stepne	n Alvesteffer	2175					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on t	he cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	LICATIO	N IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Claperiods:	replies: ( eal (with	1) an amendment, affidavit appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w vith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of t	he final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)		CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension ar shortened than thre	nd the corresponding amount o statutory period for reply origir	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compli	liance w	ith 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS	nsion the	ereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior	to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con		on and/or search (see NOT	E below);					
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	for appeal by materially red	ucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	correspo	nding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed the control of the control</li></ol>		f submitted in a separate, ti	mely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).		•	•	-				
	7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before	or on the date of filing a No	tice of Appeal will not	be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome	e <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does N	OT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (I 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SE	/08) Paper No(s)						
/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/		Stanhan Alvastaffar						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175	I	Stephen Alvesteffer Examiner Art Unit: 2175						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants assert that Johnson fails to disclose at least instructions for receiving, from the user, a plurality of configurations of the hardware device, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant further notes that Johnson does not allow a user to specify more than one configuration for a single hardware device. However, this is not the case. Applicant is directed to Johnson Figure 26, showing a hardware device having a plurality of configurations. In the "Channel List", "Voltage 0", "Voltage 1", "Voltage 2", "Voltage 3", and "Voltage 4" are each configurations of the single hardware device. Furthermore, under the "Device Settings" tab, "Output Voltage for Logic Low" and "Output Voltage for Logic High" are also each configurations of the single hardware device. Therefore, Johnson fully discloses receiving, from the user, a plurality of configurations (such as voltage settings) of the hardware device (such as the voltage measurement device), each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object. Examiner can find no teaching in the instant specification that defines a "configuration" as being the complete set of settings required to make a hardware device operate. A "configuration" can be read as a single setting of a hardware device, each hardware device requiring a plurality of configurations to be set in order to operate.

Applicants assert that Johnson fails to disclose instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The instant specification, as best understood, teaches that each hardware device may have one or more hardware objects associated with it. Each configuration corresponds to at least one property of a hardware object. While each hardware device is understood to be a physical instrument, a hardware object that corresponds to the hardware device is implemented as a software object to represent a component of the hardware device. Johnson Figure 26 shows a plurality of configurations corresponding to a plurality of hardware objects, displayed simultaneously, that represent a measurement device.

Applicants assert that Johnson does not disclose at least the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner notes that claim 30 is not directed to configuring hardware devices as in claim 1. Claim 30 is directed to the actual use of a configured measurement device. Likewise, in Johnson, when the measurement device is configured and in use, it monitors conditions at the measurement device and updates the graphical interface to alert users of the changes in the device. For example, see Johnson Figures 32A-B, showing the graphical interface being updated in response to changes in the measurement device.

Applicants assert that Johnson does not disclose a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Johnson Figure 16 shows a single graphical interface displaying a selection list of hardware objects (such as "PCI-MIO-15E-1 (Dev1)"), software objects included in the list (such as Ch0-6), and at least one configuration of the objects (such as the Timing Samples and Rate). Also, Johnson Figure 28E shows a graphical interface displaying a plurality of device objects simultaneously with their configurations.

Applicants assert that Johnson does not disclose instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of a configuration from the plurality of configurations. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Johnson makes use of dropdown boxes that contain a plurality of configurations that may be selected. For example, in Johnson Figures 19 and 20, a custom scale configuration may be selected from the "Custom Scale" dropdown box..